

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BRENT WEIBL, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT M. COWAN, *et.al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-1642-BJR

ORDER ON JOINT STIPULATION TO
EXTEND DEADLINE AND VACATE
ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on a joint stipulated motion by the parties to: (1) extend the deadline for Defendants to respond to the complaint; and (2) vacate the Court's Order Regarding Initial Disclosures and Joint Status Report. Dkt. No. 8.

The Court GRANTS in part and DENIES in part the motion and ORDERS as follows:

- (1) The Court GRANTS the motion to the extent that it seeks a 60-day extension for Defendants to respond to the complaint.
- (2) The Court DENIES the motion to the extent that it seeks to vacate the Court's Order Regarding Initial Disclosures and Joint Status Report (Dkt. No. 6, hereinafter "JSR Order").

To the extent that this matter is exempt from certain requirements in the JSR Order because Plaintiffs' complaint seeks review of an administrative record, the parties should follow

1 the provisions of the JSR Order that require the parties to file a Joint Proposed Case Plan for
2 matters that are exempt from initial disclosure requirements.¹

3 DATED February 7, 2022.

4
5 
6

7 Barbara Jacobs Rothstein
8 U.S. District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 ¹ More specifically, the parties should follow the following provisions in the JSR Order: “In matters that are exempt
26 from initial disclosures, the parties must jointly prepare and submit a Joint Proposed Case Plan, indicating whether
the matter may be resolved via dispositive motions or case briefs and proposing a schedule for the filing of such
motions or case briefs, oppositions, and replies. The case plan must also contain a statement regarding the possibility
of settlement and propose a method to explore settlement. In these types of cases, the Joint Proposed Case Plan shall
be filed on the docket and submitted to the court via email within THIRTY (30) days of the latest answer deadline,
even if dispositive motions are pending.” Dkt. No. 6 at 1-2.